

August 12, 2017

Dear FCC Chairperson, Ajit Pai, and esteemed FCC commissioners,

The recent flood of "Title II vs. Title I" "Obama Blame Game" comments about the FCC and Obama overstepping with respect to ISPs. They are missing the point. The decision should come down to how Americans see ISPs... are they (a) or (b):

a) Telecommunications service: Conduit providing us the ability to choose and consume what we want.

b) Information service: Conduit providing select (by the provider) information for the consumer's consumption.

Ironically, they have always been both, and I implore you respectfully to treat them appropriately as both. From the beginning, ISPs provided a combination of connectivity and content (message boards, NNTP, etc.). It makes sense that their telecommunications service be treated as a telecommunications service (Title II) and their information service to be treated as an information service (Title I).

The holy wars of Title I vs. Title II or Obama's FCC vs. Pai conflate the true issue. Consumers want unfettered, content neutral access to the Internet. That is my definition of Net Neutrality. Some Americans are concerned about the government and others about the ISP impeding content neutral access. If you think Title II gives the FCC too much power, then work with Congress to lightly rein in that power, maybe by creating a new classification. However, by reclassifying ISPs as information services, you leave no checks to ISPs selecting content that conflicts with their customers' unfettered information needs. Unfettered information access facilitates our Constitutional freedoms.

Thanks for your time and consideration,

Mark B. Prince